

# The North Carolina Standard.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES.....THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, JULY 25, 1838.

VOL. IV.....NO. 195.

Three Dollars per Annum.

THOMAS LORING,

Editor and Proprietor.

## TERMS.

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD is published weekly, at three dollars per annum—payable half-yearly in advance; but it will be necessary for those living at a distance, or out of the State, to pay an entire year in advance. A subscriber failing to give notice of his desire to discontinue at the expiration of the period for which he may have paid, will be considered as having subscribed anew, and the paper continued, at the option of the Editor, until ordered to be stopped; but no paper will be discontinued, until all arrears are paid.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding four lines, will be inserted one time for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion; those of greater length in proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out.

Court Advertisements and Sheriff's Sales, will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the usual rates.

A deduction of 33 1/3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year.

Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

## SPEECH

OF THE

Hon. Alexander Duncan, of Ohio, In the House of Representatives, July 6, 1838. On the bill making appropriations for harbors, and in reply to the Speech of Mr. BOND, of Ohio.

Mr. DUNCAN addressed the Committee as follows:

Mr. Chairman: I am happy to have this opportunity to make some remarks in relation to the financial policy adopted, and so far pursued, by this and the late Administration.—The bill now under consideration has been amended in the Senate, by striking out the appropriation of twenty thousand dollars for the improvement of the Cumberland river within the limits of Kentucky and Tennessee.

The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. WILLIAMS], says that this amendment was made in a certain quarter (meaning the Senate) for a certain purpose, (I suppose to punish the people of Kentucky for not being more Democratic,) and to affect a certain individual, [Mr. CLAY]. This may all be, if we are prepared to suppose that grave Senators could so far forget their high stations as to make such paltry considerations an object of action in the discharge of their high functions and sacred duties. But I think we may find another reason for this judicious and laudable amendment—a reason that has its foundation in patriotism and economy. The howl of extravagance and profligacy and bankruptcy has never been out of our ears since the commencement of the session until this time, and it will continue with the session. Yes, sir, that howl has cost the people more money than would redeem the Treasury notes now in circulation, which constitutes our present national debt. I say it was a regard for economy, and a desire to confine the appropriations within the probable estimates for the year, that induced the Senate to make the amendment in question.

Sir, what base and sickening inconsistency do we witness here every day: a charge constantly kept up that the Government is bankrupt, and the best prospects of the country ruined, by a profligate Administration; when it is a well known fact, and the journals show it, that every measure of extravagance and profligacy is brought forward, sustained, and carried through to a law, by those who are opposed to the Administration, and who are constantly denouncing it for its profligacy.

It seems, from the profligate and reckless course of the Opposition in worthless and extravagant expenditures, that bankruptcy of the Government is one of the means by which this Administration is to be brought into disrepute with the people, and finally overthrown. Whenever there is an attempt made at reform, it is denounced as demagogical. Whenever there is an attempt made at economy and prudence in public expenditures, the whole pack of Oppositionists who may have the most remote local interest, raise the howl that this attempt at economy is made for party purposes—to affect a certain State—to affect certain individuals—and to effect certain purposes. Yes, sir, although economy dwells on the lips of a certain party, extravagance has its home in their hearts. For the truth of this assertion, I refer you to the examination of the journals of the last six or eight years; where on all appropriations made that save of extravagance, there will be found a large majority of the names of those opposed to this and the late Administration in favor of such measures, and the names of a large majority of the members friendly to those Administrations will be found to be recorded against them.

Sir, I hold up the journals which contain the evidences of what I say. I only ask investigation. Among the vast number of unwarrantable appropriations, which I have not time to notice specially, I ask your attention to one, only distinguished from the rest by the size of the sum. It is the appropriation made in the session of 1835 and 1836, for liquidating the debt due from the District of Columbia to Holland, and for carrying out certain improvements for which that loan was made. This entire appropriation amounted, I think, to one and a half millions. But let us inquire for what purposes this money was applied.—It was applied first to the construction of a canal through the suburbs of your city, (Washington,) which needs a canal about as much as a cart wants a third wheel. The south side of the south wing of this Capitol faces the whole line of that canal. It is in view of every one who looks out of one of the south windows. I have been looking out for seven months, and I have yet to see the first boat disturb the stillness of its water. One is at a loss to know which to be most astonished at, the wickedness that conceived such unpardonable folly, or the sterility of the soil through which the canal is excavated, or the poverty and sterility of the country for whose benefit

it is made. This canal is of Whig origin.—The next extravagant and worthless appropriation of this money is for the construction of a turnpike road, made on the bank of the Chesapeake and Ohio canal. This road was made at great expense, and runs the extent of the District. The next is the turnpike road running parallel with the former. I am unable to draw the distinction between the folly involved in the construction of each of those roads. The existence of the one completely supersedes the necessity of the other, and both of but little use. The hill road seems to have been made to display the power of the Federal Government to prostrate hills and fill up hollows. I occasionally ride out in the evening for exercise. My rides have, some six or seven times, been on these roads. I generally go out the bottom road and return the hill road. I have once seen a shacking wagon, drawn by two mules and a jack, (Demarara team,) so poor that one might hang his hat on their hip bones. This establishment was driven by a negro half naked, lame in one leg and blind of one eye. This, sir, is a specimen of the use of what is called the bottom turnpike road; but I have never seen the first living creature on the hill road except the horse I rode. So much for the roads—useless roads.—I mean those that have come under my observation, which have been made by the people's money, and, I undertake to say, in gross violation of their rights, if not in violation of the Constitution.

But, sir, the most profligate and extravagant appropriation is yet to be presented.—It is the appropriation for the Georgetown and Alexandria canal and aqueduct. This canal is now under way. Is located on the bank of the Potomac—a canal, deep, still, and wide, (being tide water.) Why, sir, what will your people say when they learn that half a million of their money has been appropriated for the construction of a canal on the bank of the Potomac—a canal constructed by the Almighty, as far superior to your pitiful efforts, as the majestic steamboat that rides upon its bosom is superior to the contemptible packet that floats upon your canal? But, sir, for whose benefit has this vast appropriation been made? For the benefit of the city of Alexandria. It is almost incredible with those who have seen Alexandria within the last three or four years, that such an appropriation should be made for her—a city that seems to have the anger of God and the hand of ruin upon it—now desolation itself, and without the most remote prospect of ever surviving.—The most total abstraction of trade from her port, the barrenness and poverty of the soil that surrounds her, must ever prevent her from being revived. Nothing can save her from final prostration and ruin. In half a century from this time, there will hardly be a standing monument of art for the tooth of time to operate upon; and yet it was for the benefit of these tottering remains of a city that this vast and expensive work has been undertaken, and to finish it must take much of the sacred proceeds of toil and sweat of those who will never see or witness the practical result of such consummate folly and wicked extravagance. Sir, you may draw upon the industry of the people for, and recover, a sufficient amount to complete this work; but there never will be commercial motion enough on it to prevent the stagnation of its water. The noble canal which the Almighty has made, (the Potomac,) and of which yours is but a contemptible imitation, will forever bear the produce destined for other places, (no toll being to be paid on it, but, like other Divine gifts, free.) Your canal will be the generator and birth-place of reptiles, and the abode of frogs. It will be a putrid, green pool of pestilence; and its exhalations will spread disease and death over your country. These, sir, are specimens of the appropriations that have emptied your Treasury, and been part of the means that have made it necessary for you to use your credit in the form of Treasury notes, to keep the wheels of Government in motion; and I repeat it, that these profligate appropriations are made at the instance, and carried into ruinous practice by the votes of the very party who are constantly denouncing this and the late Administration for their extravagance and profligacy.

Sir, my object in discussing this question is not only for the purpose of sustaining the amendment in question, and to sustain the principles and policy that induced it, but also to answer and refute many of the propositions and assertions contained in a small pamphlet which I hold in my hand, purporting to be a speech delivered by my colleague, [Mr. BOND, from Ohio,] on a resolution offered some time since by the gentleman from Virginia, on the subject of the public printing.

In order to give his remarks upon that resolution some force with the Democratic party, my colleague says that the gentleman who offered it acts generally with the Administration party. I deny that assertion. I deny that the gentleman from Virginia, [Col. HOPKINS,] has acted generally with the Administration party; and I say so without any disrespect to the gentleman, for he has a right to act with whatever party he pleases, and no one has a right to question his motives. But fair play is a jewel; and my colleague must represent things as they are, not as he would desire to have them, for political effect. Sir, this is a little pamphlet, but it contains more Federal poison in a small way, than any thing I ever saw of the kind. It is a little pamphlet, and its whole contents remind me of minnow-catching. I live near a river called the Little Miami; and into it there empties a creek called Sycamore. I fish in the river, and my boy catches minnows in the creek for bait.—It is this last operation that the contents of this little pamphlet remind me of. It is a system of a small kind of fault-finding; and yet I am told that there is not a foul stream of Federalism in the Union, on which it does not float. Every corrupt, bought-up Federal press

in these United States, I am told, has given it an insertion in its columns; and the mails have groaned under the weight of its multiplied numbers, by the franking privilege, ever since it made its appearance.

Sir, seeing, on one occasion, a great number of Federal members engaged busily in franking documents, my curiosity induced me to walk round among them to inquire what documents they were franking for distribution. I asked one: Mr. BOND's speech; another: Mr. BOND's speech; another: Mr. BOND's speech; and so on. This led me to a perusal of my colleague's speech, and the vast circulation which was given to it, for political effect, induced me to collect some statistics by which I might neutralize any poisonous effects his speech might have on the political atmosphere.—Those statistics I have procured, and have them in my hand, and will ask that they may constitute a part of my speech, which I design to write out more fully than time will now permit to deliver.

But to the speech. My colleague complains that, within the last nine years, there has been an increase of public officers and of public expenditures, which he charges as a fault of the party in power. It is their fault, too, I suppose, that within the same time, two new States have been added to our Union, and several millions of people to our population. If public officers have been increased, so has public business, and in a much greater ratio. As a matter of course, an increase of expenditures must follow. If this be an evil, it can only be cured by stopping the extension of our settlements, and the increase of our population. There is a large increase of clerks in the New York custom-house; but the business there has been more than doubled.—There has been a large increase of clerks in the Land Office; but the business of that office has increased ten fold. It was physically impossible that the President could sign the increased number of land patents, and yet it is made an offence to create another officer for that purpose. There has been some increase of clerks in the War Department; but the business in that Department has been more than doubled. The number of Postmasters has been doubled, and so has the number of Post Offices, for the convenience of the people.

Would our new-light Bank Federal reformers have six or seven thousand post offices discontinued, to avoid an increase of Executive officers? Do the people want any such reform? Would they shut up the land offices, because to keep them open requires an increase of officers? Would they deny patents to purchasers of land, because it takes a few additional clerks to make them out? Shall the business of all the Departments remain undone, because it requires more clerks to do it as it increases with the growth of our country? These would be reforms worthy of Federal Bank reformers! Let the business of the people's Government remain undone, and the Banks will govern for the people.

There are few offices, if any, in the country, in which the public business has not increased faster than the clerks and the expenditure. As our country increases, the public officers and public expenditures must and will increase. It is unavoidable, as every man knows. It is as stupid as wicked to complain of the party in power on account of this increase, for no party can prevent it and do its duty to the country. The only inquiry should be, whether there are too many clerks to do the public business; whether any of them spend in idleness the time for which the people pay. If so, they should be lopped off.—But no such thing is alleged. It is not asserted that the clerks who have been added have not enough to do, or that the public business could possibly be done without them.

These new-light Federal-Bank-Reformers propose no measures to retrench, because they know that no retrenchment can be made, but seek only to fill the country with false impressions, for the sake of producing political results favorable to the Federal-Bank cause.—This game of base and foul lying, to get into power, is as old as Absalom, the son of David, and older too. My colleague undertakes to arraign certain members of the Administration for having, in some instances, received payment for extra services. But does he pretend that any one of them has received such compensation in violation of law? Not at all. He knows that the principles upon which those allowances were made have been repeatedly adjudicated upon and sanctioned by the Supreme Court, the highest judicial tribunal in the country. The allowances, therefore, were all lawful. Is the principle wrong? If gentlemen think so, why do they not bring forth a proposition making all such allowances unlawful? If they were really in favor of a reform, or change in this respect, should we not see them proving it by acts rather than by words? They have a majority in this House, and have had during this seven months' session, and yet they have made no attempt at reform of any kind.

Perhaps my colleague may have thought the prospect discouraging; but he ought not to have stopped on that account, he ought rather to have followed the example of the gallant Colonel Miller, who, when he was ordered on a perilous service on the Niagara frontier during the war of 1812, did not say it was impracticable, but said "I'll try, sir," to the commanding general. He did try, and he succeeded. The achievement not only rendered essential service at that crisis, but honored his country's arms, and elevated his own fame. I hope my colleague will not be dismayed, because the undertaking of reform of the abuses of which he complains is perilous. If he will try he may succeed, and if he does he will render essential service to his country, and crown himself with laurels as unfading as those of Colonel Miller. But, sir, the fact

that they content themselves with mere clamor, without attempting to do any thing to bring about reform, is conclusive that they do not believe there is any thing wrong in the principle, and have only one object in view, that is to put others out of office that they may get in. How they used their power over the public money while in office, and how they may be expected to use it again, I will attempt to show before I am done.

But my colleague brings a general charge against the party in power, who, by their representatives in part (Colonel BENTON, Mr. CAMBRELENG, and others) had promised something like reform (should they get into power) in abuses which they said existed, and which they set out in a report on that subject, and which my colleague has presented in a garbled manner to be public attention, through his speech. Does my colleague not know that many of the abuses in that report complained of, grew out of the manner in which the powers that then existed got into office, and the corrupt manner by which they held the Administration of the Government? The Government fountain being corrupt, all the streams that flowed from it conveyed abuse and violation wherever they reached; and that by a reformation of the Administration, most of the abuses that flowed from it were dried up; which, in a great degree, superseded the necessity of further reform. Some abuses still remained; they were reformed in part, as I will show you before I am done. Some remain unreformed, and always will, as they do in all Governments, and are of a nature like the cholera, incurable. Yes, sir, the people have made that general reformation, by pulling down an Administration that had its origin in a corrupt bargain, and existed in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, and the sacred right of the elective franchise.

Here, sir, permit me to name some of the objections my colleague presents to the public against this Administration. Some of the practices which he denounces as corrupt, and still existing, notwithstanding the reform the people were promised; and permit me to compare these practices, that he is pleased to denounce as corrupt, with those of a similar character, but a thousand times more aggravating, as practiced by the administration of Messrs. CLAY and ADAMS, which is urged upon us as worthy of example, and entitled to the confidence of the Administration people, and soon to be revived.

My colleague complains that the aggregate expenses of the Government far exceeds the expenses of the administration of the dynasty which he wishes revived.

That there is an additional number of clerks in all the Departments, and consequently an unnecessary expense incurred to the Government. Such is the character of his charges against each of the departments of the Government.

And now sir, I proceed to answer the gentleman on some of these charges, and, I trust, I shall be not only able to prove many of these destitute of foundation in truth, but that the gentleman has withheld many important truths in relation to reforms and abuses, which it is due to this Administration that the people should know.

Sir, there is very little difference in the moral offence of withholding the truth, where it may be due to reputation and character that it should be told, and telling that which is wilfully false. The gentleman constantly (indirectly) holds up to view the coalition administration (Adams and Clay) as a mirror, in which is to be seen a pure Administration, I think, sir, we will find some corruptions charged to this and the last administration, which will be found to have been practiced with impunity in that. One of the great violations of economy and extravagant expenditures of the administration of General Jackson was sending Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Randolph severally, as Ministers to Russia, with a salary of \$9000 per annum, and an outfit of \$9000; that each of them staid but a year and a day, and then returned. Now, sir, let us see if we can offset this "useless" expenditure of General Jackson's administration by one of a similar character in the administration of Messrs. Adams and Clay. During the immaculate dynasty which my colleague desires to have renewed, no less than three ministers were sent to England, viz: King, Barbour, and Gallatin, with an annual salary of \$9000, and an outfit of \$9000. This made \$27,000 in outfit, besides the annual salary, which amounted to the same. Also the son of Rufus King, who was left Secretary of Legation, was left by his father as Charge d'Affairs, who received an outfit of \$4,500, although (being there) he had not to fit out at all.

Then the account for money expended for keeping up our legation in England during that short reign of corruption and bargain, which only lasted four years, was—

Outfit for R. King	\$9,000
" for A. Gallatin	9,000
" for J. Barbour	9,000
" for Mr. King's son; who never was fitted out	4,500
Salary for do	4,500
" " Ministers	27,000
	\$63,000

Yes, sir, \$63,000 was spent during that Administration, to procure the discharge of the diplomatic duties of one single individual.—I think this will offset the Russia diplomatic story. My colleague had better have kept that story in the dark, as his reform is a kind of one-sided reform. My colleague says the State Department sent Mr. Early to Bogota with despatches, and that he never delivered them, but received his pay. Well, sir, this was a hard case, and taken in the abstract, speaks of fraud and improvidence. But what is the whole story? Mr. Early was sent to Bogota with despatches: when on the way, and within two days of St. Thomas, the vessel in which he had taken passage caught fire.—

There was a cargo of powder on board.—The crew and passengers, amounting to nineteen in all, were instantly, to save their lives, compelled to take to boats, two in number.—They had left the vessel but half an hour when she blew up: and with her went the despatches. After the lapse of seventy-four hours without water or food, the famished crew reached the island of Hayti, from whence they got home as well as they could. I believe Mr. Early was paid the same as though he had delivered the despatches. Perhaps this was wrong; but I can tell you something worse under the coalition administration.

Mr. Clay (Secretary of State) sent Mr. Pleasant to Buenos Ayres with despatches.—It is said that he found the crew rather unpleasant, (he being a pleasant man,) being principally mechanics and workmen, and not the white fingered gentry. He put the despatches in the possession of the captain, and he wheeled about and put for England, where he amused himself in high life a time, and returned; for which Mr. Clay paid him nineteen hundred and forty dollars. So I think this will offset the charge of paying Mr. Early.

So far, I think my colleague has been unfortunate in his charges, inasmuch as they have the effect to call to recollection charges against the dynasty he wishes to reinstate, much more aggravating and pernicious.—This, so far, seems to me to be a blunder on his part; but the worst have to come yet.—I think his speech will be unfortunate for his party and his purposes. Another most important blunder has been committed by my colleague in his "few comments on the professions and practice of Mr. Amos Kendall, late Fourth Auditor, now Postmaster General." He quotes from certain letters of that gentleman, published soon after he came into office, showing some of the abuses he found in office, committed by my colleague's political friends, and showing, also, that he had or would reform them, and affects to show that he had not done so. One of these extracts is as follows, viz: "The interest of the country demands that this office shall be filled with men of business, and not with babbling politicians." Can any man say with truth that this principle was not carried out? I assert, sir, and challenge contradiction, that the Fourth Auditor's Office, while Mr. Kendall was in it, was "filled with men of business," and not "with babbling politicians."

Mr. Kendall himself was "a man of business," and neither he nor his clerks ever neglected their public duties to babble politics with any one. When he went into that office, what did he find to be its condition under the dynasty which my colleague is laboring to restore? Was it all purity, all honesty, all industry? No, sir; it was all rottenness, all idleness.—His predecessor was one of the favorites of the Clay party; and Mr. Kendall soon discovered that he had been guilty of the grossest and most direct frauds on the Treasury, of which he was found guilty by an unwilling court, and more an unwilling jury, after a tremendous party struggle to secure him from punishment. What thanks did Mr. Kendall get from my colleague and his party for exposing these frauds, and bringing them to merited punishment? Why, sir, he was abused through the party presses as a conspirator and persecutor, and while the prosecution of the culprit was in progress, was night after night insulted and hooted at under his window. Yes, sir, this was the mode the gentleman's party undertook to prevent the exposure and punishment of their corruptions. This was the reward they, then bestowed on integrity and fearlessness in office; and the same game has been kept up since, down to the speech of my colleague.—Now, I ask, was it no reform to remove a peculator upon the Treasury? My colleague does not seem to think so. Why? Is it because he belonged to his party?

Well, Mr. Kendall filled the Fourth Auditor's Office "with men of business," and what was the consequence? Much of its business was one, two, and three years in arrears, and in about a twelve month, it was brought completely up. Did he obtain or ask any additional force? No, sir. After the business was brought up, he suffered two clerkships to remain vacant for a long time, & one until he left the office, because, having "men of business" about him, he did not need the whole force which the law allowed. Moreover, under the Clay administration, which my colleague would restore, the contingent appropriation for the Fourth Auditor's Office was \$1,500 a year; but Mr. Kendall reduced it to \$1,000, and one year asked for no appropriation at all, having enough surplus of former appropriations on hand to meet his wants. Thus the expenditures of the office were largely reduced by him, while its business was greatly improved. What credit do my colleague and his friends give him for it? They have poured on him, from beginning to end, a torrent of unceasing abuse.—On every new exposure of a defaulter or a rogue, through his instrumentality, their abuse has been redoubled, clearly showing that an honest and fearless public officer is their highest antipathy.

While complaining that the party in power have not made the promised reforms, my colleague gives incontestible evidence of his sincerity by sneering at those which were made. He even finds grounds of attack upon Mr. Kendall for sending to the post office, to be charged with postage, the letters and pamphlets fraudulently enclosed to the Fourth Auditor to evade the post office laws, and for discontinuing sundry newspapers, because he could derive no assistance from them "in settling the accounts of the United States Navy." Yes, sir, in the reforms actually made by Mr. Kendall, as well as in those not made, the bank attorneys, immaculate and consistent men! find ground of attack!!

When Mr. Kendall went into the Fourth

Auditor's office, the legal postage on private letters received under cover to the Fourth Auditor, was about a dollar a day, or at the rate of \$365 a year, and on the supposition that as great a number had gone out under his predecessor's frank, the fraud on the post office revenue, through that single office, under the CLAY-ADAMS administration, was over \$700 a year! Mr. Kendall put an entire stop to this abuse, and what thanks does he get from the Bank stipendiaries? They hate and abuse him the worse for it. But, says my colleague, he franked some prospectuses of the Globe. Well, if he chose to send them to his friends, had he not a lawful right to do so? Did he violate any law, or do so much of it as to constitute an abuse? That is not pretended, nor can it be with truth. But because he put a stop to violations of the law, and then exercised his privilege in conformity with law, the Bank attorneys find an inconsistency in it! I can tell my colleague upon undoubted authority, that Mr. Kendall's course in that respect is not changed; that he uniformly sends to the post office letters for others enclosed to him, to be charged with postage, and sometimes pays it himself; that he covers no letters with his frank, not strictly his own; no, not even those of his wife and children. What praise does he get from the Bank attorneys for this scrupulous obedience to the law? The highest praise—their unceasing abuse.

My colleague finds a vast inconsistency in Mr. Kendall's discontinuing newspapers as Fourth Auditor, because they gave him no assistance "in settling the accounts of the United States Navy," and paying for a number of them as Postmaster General! Is this effort to show inconsistency a whit short of contemptible? The papers were not of use to him in performing his public duty as Fourth Auditor, and therefore he did not take them; they are of use to him in performing his duty as Postmaster General, and therefore he does not discontinue them. Is there any inconsistency in this? None but a Bank attorney can make it out. While Mr. Kendall was Fourth Auditor, he paid all his newspaper subscriptions out of his own pocket, because they were exclusively for his private use, but, as Postmaster General, it is essential that he should have not only the general but the local intelligence from every quarter of the country, and the only wonder is that he pays so little for it.

It is natural, sir, for the Bank attorneys to find fault with the part acted by Mr. Kendall in the removal of the deposits. Their client was destroyed by that measure, and the source of many a good fee dried up. But here, again, Mr. Kendall is followed by misrepresentation. "He got ten dollars a day," it is said, "for doing this injury to the public!" meaning the Bank. Now, sir, I pronounce this statement entirely without foundation.—Mr. Kendall, under an appointment from the Secretary of the Treasury, visited the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston, to negotiate with the banks, and spent some days in each city. He had necessarily to see much company at the hotels where he stopped, and those who have had occasion to take private parlors, and have private tables, at the public houses in those cities, where they necessarily see, and treat civilly, many gentlemen calling on them, know that the actual expense, including travelling, can scarcely average less than ten dollars a day. Mr. Kendall paid all these expenses out of his own pocket, and received from the Treasury barely enough to make himself whole. This is the whole of this mighty affair, and the sum received, all told, was \$316 11. How rich this man must have made himself!

My colleague follows Mr. Kendall into the Post Office Department, and makes another mistake at the first jump. "The printed list of clerks in his Department," says he, "exhibits his father-in-law and two nephews, with salaries of \$1,000, \$1,200, and \$1,400, &c. Mr. Kendall has not, and never had, two nephews among the clerks of his Department. But what if he had two nephews in his Department? Have they not as good a right to be there as any body else, if they are honest and competent to the duties assigned? If there be places of peculiar trust, it is wrong that the head of a Department should fill them with men whose integrity he best knows, although they may be his nephews or his brother? When abuses and frauds, instead of the most honest and honorable discharge of their public duties, are perpetrated by his relations, it will be time enough to censure their appointment.

Nothing will satisfy these Bank attorneys. Major Barry is abused for not keeping every thing right in the Post Office Department, and Mr. Kendall is abused for putting every thing right. The committees of Congress, majority and minority, complained of Major Barry for making extravagant allowances to Stockton and Stokes, and now Mr. Kendall is abused for not being willing to pay them allowances a thousand times more extravagant. One of my worthy colleagues [Mr. WHITTLESLEY] I believe wrote some twenty-five pages in a book, 30,000 copies of which were printed by order of the House, to prove that Major Barry had allowed those contractors some \$100,000 more than they were entitled to by law, and yet voted for an act under color of which they have been allowed \$161,000 more under the same pretences, and has stood quietly by and seen Mr. Kendall compelled to pay it by judicial usurpation, if not something worse. I should like to ask my honorable colleague [Mr. WHITTLESLEY] a question or two. Did he not thoroughly understand this case, having investigated and written a long report about it? When the bill for the relief of Stockton and Stokes was before the House, did he not offer a long string of provision, which were adopted?—Were not those provisions, so carefully framed as not to touch one of the claims in contra-